



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/744,820	01/30/2001	Friedrich Welcker	WELCKER-1	4500

25889 7590 09/13/2002

WILLIAM COLLARD  
COLLARD & ROE, P.C.  
1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD  
ROSLYN, NY 11576

EXAMINER

PRASAD, CHANDRIKA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/744,820

Applicant(s)

WELCKER, FRIEDRICH

Examiner

Chandrika Prasad

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 35-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. The reply filed on 07/09/02 consists of amendments to claim 20 and remarks related to rejection of claims. The claims are not allowable as explained below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 20-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottlieb in view of Wible.

Gottlieb (Figure 3) shows a battery terminal having cable 16 having a strand with a plurality of fine wires formed into a further section at an end of the strand where the wires are pressed together. A contact piece is coupled to only one side of the further section and the further section extends at an angle to the longitudinal axis of the cable. But Gottlieb does not show the further section welded to the contact piece. The instant invention does not provide any reasons or specific problem to be solved by welding. Furthermore, welding two pieces together is common knowledge. Wible (Figure 1) shows a strand 44 coupled to a contact piece 40 by welding. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to weld the Gottlieb strand to the contact piece because this would provide a permanent connection as shown by Wible, which is common knowledge.

Art Unit: 2839

4. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottlieb as modified by Wible as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Budnick.

Gottlieb and Wible show all the features of this claim except the further section formed from wires made of copper. The use of copper for the wires of a cable is common knowledge and well known in the art of electrical connectors. Budnick shows a battery cable made of copper wires. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make the Gottlieb cable wires made of copper as shown by Budnick because it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use.

#### ***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2839

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 20-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Gottlieb shows the contact piece coupled to the further section on only one side.

***Contact Information***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad whose telephone number is (703) 308-0977.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached at (703) 308-3119. The fax number for this Group is (703) 872-9318 (general) and (703) 872-9319 for after-final.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or processing should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.



Chandrika Prasad

August 27, 2002



BRIAN SIRCUS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800